

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY  
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

JOE PAUL SMITH

COMPLAINANT

V.

SOUTH CENTRAL BELL TELEPHONE  
COMPANY

DEFENDANT

CASE NO. 94-277

O R D E R

On July 22, 1994, Joe Paul Smith filed a formal complaint with the Public Service Commission against South Central Bell Telephone Company ("South Central Bell"). On August 1, 1994, South Central Bell was ordered to satisfy the matters complained of or to file a written answer in response to the complaint. South Central Bell filed its written response on August 15, 1994. The response indicates that satisfaction has been given to Mr. Smith by installation of telephone service on August 12, 1994.

Mr. Smith placed a request on June 22, 1994 to transfer service from 6658 Springfield Road to 3220 Ashes Creek Lane. On June 30, 1994, South Central Bell contacted Mr. Smith and advised that service would not be available at 3220 Ashes Creek Lane until October 30, 1994. South Central Bell also advised Mr. Smith the reason for the delay was that facilities were not available to

serve him and significant construction would have to take place to provide him service. On August 9, 1994, another customer residing on Ashes Creek Lane disconnected his service; therefore, facilities became available for South Central Bell to serve Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith was advised that his service would be connected by August 12, 1994. Mr. Smith, in his complaint of July 22, 1994, asked that phone service be installed within 10 days. The Commission finds that since Mr. Smith has now been provided with telephone service by South Central Bell, no further consideration of this portion of Mr. Smith's complaint is required by this Commission.

Mr. Smith also stated in his complaint that he should not have to pay a monthly mileage surcharge. The Commission further finds that this charge is actually a mileage band zone charge for local exchange service outside the base rate area of the exchange, but within the exchange, or local rate area. South Central Bell has this rate on file with the Commission in its General Subscriber Services Tariff A.3.9.2. This charge has been approved by this Commission for all customers similarly situated.


IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this complaint has been properly satisfied by the defendant and is dismissed.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 21st day of October, 1994.


PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

  
Chairman

  
Vice Chairman

  
Commissioner

ATTEST:

  
Executive Director